



CRM-M-37574-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

105

CRM-M-37574-2025

Date of decision : 17.07.2025

HARJIT SINGH AND ANOTHER

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H. S. GREWAL**Present:-** Mr. Dheeraj Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioners.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. This is a petition for anticipatory bail under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 in cross version case bearing DDR No.40 dated 28.05.2025 under Sections 118(1), 115(2), 3(5) of BNS (Section 118(2) of BNS added later on) Police Station Dinanagar registered in FIR No.96 dated 09.05.2025 under Sections 117(2), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS registered at Police Station Dinanagar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that earlier an FIR was registered on the statement of Palwinder Kaur-petitioner No.2, wife of Harjit Singh-petitioner No.1 wherein allegations were made against Inderjeet Singh and others that they had caused injuries to the petitioners. However, in the present case, on the statement of Inderjeet Singh, an offence under Section 326 IPC has been made out qua petitioner No.1-Harjit Singh that he had given *datar* blow at Inderjeet Singh, which was stopped by the injured by raising his left wrist resulting in the injury. The role attributed to petitioner No.2 in this case is of raising a *lalkara*.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends as per allegations levelled in the DDR, no specific role has been attributed to petitioner no.2. He further states that the aforesaid case of cross version has been registered after a delay of 33 days.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the



respondent-State.

6. Mr. M.S. Basra, Advocate with Mr. A.S. Brar, Advocate puts in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of the complainant and opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to petitioner No.1 on the ground that he had caused grievous injury to the injured namely Inderjeet Singh. He further states that he, however, has no objection in case petitioner no.2 is granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Learned counsel for the State opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the allegations made against the petitioners are grave in nature and prays for dismissal of the anticipatory bail.

8. I have heard learned counsel for both the parties and have considered the allegations against the both the petitioners. The petitioner no-1 is stated to have caused grievous injury to the injured while the role attributed to petitioner No.2 is that of raising a *lalkara*.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, petitioner no.1- Harjit Singh does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and the present petition qua petitioner No.1 is dismissed.

10. Further, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition qua-petitioner No.2-Palwinder Kaur is allowed and is granted the concession of anticipatory bail. However, the petitioner no.2 shall abide by the conditions stipulated under Section 482(2), BNSS and shall also join investigation as and when called upon to do so.

11. The present petition stands disposed of.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

July 17, 2025
Sonia Puri

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No